03-22-04 image AF/1774.15

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10) Applicant(s): **Robert A. Migliorini et al.**			Docket No. **10212/2**
Serial No. **09/747,537**	Filing Date **December 22, 2000**	Examiner **Kevin R. Kruer**	Group Art Unit **1774**

Invention: **Multi-Layer Oriented Polypropylene Films With Modified Core**

I hereby certify that the following correspondence:

Transmittal, Appeal Brief (18 pages) in triplicate

(Identify type of correspondence)

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on **19 March 2004**
(Date)

Jacqueline M. Jackson
(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)

Jacqueline M. Jackson
(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)

EV366442449US
("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF (Large Entity)	Docket No. 10212/2

In Re Application Of: **Robert A. Migliorini, et al.**

Serial No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Group Art Unit
09/747,537	December 22, 2000	Kevin R. Kruer	1774

Invention: **MULTI-LAYER ORIENTED POLYPROPYLENE FILMS WITH MODIFIED CORE**

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith in triplicate is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on **September 17, 2003.**

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is: **$330.00**

☐ A check in the amount of the fee is enclosed.

☐ The Director has already been authorized to charge fees in this application to a Deposit Account.

☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **05-1712**

Signature

Dated: **March 19, 2004**

Rick F. James, Reg. No. 48,772
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited on with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

cc:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application of:	Robert A. Migliorini et al.	Conf. No.: 2084
Serial Number:	09/747,537	
Filed:	December 22, 2000	
Title:	MULTI-LAYER ORIENTED POLYPROPYLENE FILMS WITH MODIFIED CORE	
Group Art Unit:	1774	
Examiner:	Kevin R. Kruer	Date: March 19, 2004

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.192(a)

Sir:

Appellants appeal to the honorable Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 set forth in the Final Rejection mailed September 17, 2003 as supplemented by the Advisory Actions of November 21, 2003 and March 9, 2004.

As required, this Appeal Brief is being filed in triplicate.

A payment in the amount of $330 is provided herewith for the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(c). The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 05-1712.

1. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is ExxonMobil Oil Corporation, a corporation of the state of New York.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

No related appeals or interferences exist at this time.

3. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 are before the Board for consideration. Claims 8, 11, 31-32, 34 and 36 are cancelled.

4. Status of Amendments

No amendments after the Final Rejection have been filed.

5. Summary of the Invention

The claimed inventions are multi-layer polymeric films and methods for producing the films. The films are high shrink films having a core layer and two skin layers. At least one of the skin layers incorporates a copolymer or terpolymer material. The core layer incorporates a polypropylene, a polymeric modifier, and a hydrocarbon resin (or petroleum resin). The films exhibit many beneficial attributes without the need for high levels of expensive hydrocarbon resins. Specifically, the films are characterized as having excellent: (a) optics; (b) mechanical properties; (c) greater than 20% overall area reduction attributable to shrinkage at 135° C; (d) good slip properties for high speed packaging; and (e) sealability.

6. Issues

A. Whether claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 30 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Schloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg?

B. Whether claim 12 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Schloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita?

C. Whether claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, 29, and 30 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Schloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller?

D. Whether claim 12 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Schloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita?

E. Whether claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-28, 30, 33, 35, and 37-38 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg?

F. Whether claim 12 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita?

G. Whether claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-30, 33, 35, and 37-38 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller?

H. Whether claim 12 is obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita?

7. Grouping of Claims

When a patent issues from this application, each claim will enjoy a presumption of validity under 35 U.S.C. § 282. However, for the purposes of this Appeal, claims 1-7, 9-10 and 12-18 relating to multi-layer polymeric shrink films stand or fall together, and claims 19-30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 relating to methods for manufacturing multi-layer polymeric shrink films stand or fall together separate from claims 1-7, 9-10 and 12-18.

8. Arguments

Issue A

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Shloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg.

Shloegl discloses shrinkable multi-layer polymeric film structures having polypropylene core layers that also contain low molecular weight resins. The films also have sealing skin layers on each side of the core layer made from olefinic materials.

Blemberg also discloses multi-layer film structures but the structures have adjacent layers made from dissimilar polymeric materials. For example, the Blemberg films have polyolefin layers that are adjacent to layers made from non-polyolefins such as vinylidene chloride copolymers, polyamides, polycarbonates, and polyesters. Blemberg discloses that a small amount of a non-polyolefin polymeric material from one layer such as the polyester, vinylidene chloride copolymer, polyamide, or polycarbonate layer may be included in the polyolefin layer to promote adhesion between the two layers.

The rejection concludes that it would be obvious, based upon the teachings of Blemberg, to include a small portion of the polymeric modifier material found in the skin layer of the Schloegl film in the core layer of Schloegl's film to produce a film having a core layer incorporating a polyolefin, a hydrocarbon resin, and a polymeric modifier.

It is well understood that the teaching of a reference as a whole should be considered. *In re Wesslau*, 353 F.2d 238, 147 U.S.P.Q. 391 (C.C.P.A. 1965) advises that "it is impermissible within the framework of section 103 to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art." In *Bausch & Lomb, Inc. v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, Inc.*, 796 F.2d 443, 230 U.S.P.Q. 416 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 823 (1987), *on remand*, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1929 (N.D. Calif. 1989), the Federal Circuit held that a single line in a prior art reference should not be taken out of context and relied upon with the benefit of hindsight to show obviousness. Rather, a reference should be considered as a whole, and portions arguing against or teaching away from the claimed invention

must be considered. Obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. *In re Geiger*, 815 F.2d 686, 688, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir 1988). It is well settled that motivation to modify the prior art must come from the prior art itself. *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 U.S.P.Q.2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

The rejection acknowledges that Shloegl does not teach that the core layer of his films should include a polymeric modifier. It appears the asserted motivation for combining the teachings of Shloegl and Blemberg, in the manner set forth in the Final Rejection, is to improve adhesion between the layers of Schloegl's film.

The focus of Blemberg is to improve adhesion between polyolefin layers and layers of other non-polyolefinic materials including vinylidene chloride copolymers, polyesters, polyamides and/or polycarbonates of the cast films. *See*, column 1, lines 27-29 and column 2, lines 32-35. Blemberg makes it clear that adhesion problems between layers of these particular types of dissimilar materials are known to exist. Blemberg proposes to solve the adhesion problem by blending 10% - 30% of the non-polyolefin material found in one layer into an adjacent layer.

In contrast, Shloegl relates to films wherein the core layer is a polyolefin material (column 3, lines 12-16) and the adjacent sealing layers are also polyolefin materials (column 3, lines 35-60). Therefore, the teachings and suggestions of Blemberg are simply inapplicable to the Shloegl reference. Moreover, Shloegl reveals no adhesion problems between layers nor would one expect adhesion problems in his films because of the chemical similarities of the adjacent layer materials.

This fact is convincingly supported in the record by the Declaration of inventor, Robert Migliorini, filed January 20, 2004, pointing out that adhesion problems do not exist between adjacent polyolefin film layers. In response to the Declaration, the March 9, 2004 Advisory Action asserts that the prior art indicates that adhesion problems between adjacent polyolefin

film layers exist. However, the prior art is not identified nor is such a teaching disclosed in any of the prior art of record. The record does not support the Advisory Action conclusion.

The requisite motivation to combine the teachings of Schloegl and Blemberg to render the rejected claims obvious is missing. Even when all of the claimed elements are found in the prior art references, there must be motivation found within the references or knowledge in the art to combine the references as applied in a rejection. *See*, *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). One skilled in the art would not be motivated to apply the teachings of Blemberg to Shloegl since there is no reason to do so because of the lack of the need for Blemberg's benefits. In particular, there is absolutely no motivation to add the polymeric modifier used in the skin layers of Blemberg into the core layer of Scholegl, absent hindsight reconstruction.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse these rejections of claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 30.

Issue B

Claim 12 is rejected over the same application of the Schloegl and Blemberg patents as applied in Issue A and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita. For the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 30 in Issue A, application of the Schloegl and Blemberg patents in combination with the Arita patent fails to render claim 12 obvious.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse this rejection of claim 12.

Issue C

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,234,733 to Schloegl in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller.

Shloegl discloses biaxially shrinkable multi-layer polymeric film structures having polypropylene core layers that also contain a low molecular weight resin. The films exhibit greater shrinkage in the transverse direction than the machine or longitudinal direction. In

particular, the shrink in the transverse direction is 35% at 120° C and the shrink in the longitudinal direction is 15% at 120° C. *See*, column 4, lines 52-62. The films also have sealing skin layers on each side of the core layer made from olefinic materials.

Keller discloses a uniaxial shrinkable multi-layer film polyolefin structures that include a polymeric modifier in the core layer. The films are shrinkable in only the machine direction. The polymeric modifier is added to the core layer to prevent tearing of the film during the secondary machine direction orientation process that takes place after conventional biaxial orientation. "The composition of the polypropylene-containing core layer of the multilayer film of [Keller] must provide sufficient operability so that the film after biaxial orientation exhibits crystallinity which is low enough to permit the secondary orientation of the film, which imparts the uniaxial shrinkability to the film, without tearing." Column 4, lines 42-47.

The rejection contends it would be obvious to include a polymeric modifier in the core layer of the Schloegl film as taught by Keller. While the films of both Schloegl and Keller are multi-layer polymeric films, the films are quite different because of the fundamentally different techniques used to produce the films of Schloegl and Keller. Because of these fundamentally different production processes, one skilled in the art has no motivation to look to the teachings of Keller to modify Shloegl.

The Schloegl films are produced by conventional biaxial orientation techniques. In these processes, a film extrudate is stretched in the longitudinal direction, and then stretched in the transverse direction, and then heat set. *See*, column 6, lines 56-58. This is a conventional process that is routinely performed without tearing or breaking of the film. *See*, Migliorini Declaration at ¶ 10. In contrast, the process used to produce the films of the Keller patent is referred to as an unconventional "secondary orientation" process. *See*, Keller column 4, lines 42-47. In this process, the film is stretched first in the longitudinal direction and then in the transverse direction. At this point, the process resembles the conventional biaxial orientation process of Schloegl. However, thereafter, the film is cooled and then stretched again in the longitudinal direction. *See*, column 9, lines 26-56 for details of the process. The secondary orientation process of Keller produces oriented films that are shrinkable in only one direction.

Column 3, lines 39-49 disclose that the Keller films have a transverse shrinkage of 1% or less while exhibiting machine direction shrinkage of at least 25%. In contrast, the conventional biaxial orientation process of Shloegl produces films shrinkable in both the longitudinal and transverse directions. In particular, the films exhibit shrinkage of 15% in the longitudinal direction and 35% in the transverse direction. See, column 4, lines 52-62.

Importantly, Keller acknowledges that conventional biaxially oriented films, such as disclosed by Schloegl, **"exhibit desirable strength and tear resistance in both directions of orientation"**. *See*, Keller at column 2, lines 5-7. Keller goes on to express a desire to produce a uniaxially heat shrinkable film resistant to tearing like a biaxially oriented film such as disclosed by Schloegl. Column 2, lines 7-20.

In an effort to produce a uniaxially shrinkable film with the stability of a biaxially oriented film, Keller uses the secondary orientation process. However, Keller observes that the secondary orientation step prompts the film to tear. See, column 4, line 40 through line 4 of column 5. Keller solves the tearing problem by inclusion of a polymeric modifier in the core layer of the film to reduce crystallinity and reduce the tendency to tear. *Id.* Keller provides no teaching or suggestion that the modifier is useful in the primary orientation step, i.e., the conventional biaxial orientation process.

Since Shloegl does not include a secondary machine direction orientation step following biaxial orientation, one would not look to Keller's teachings to suggest including a modifier in Shloegl's core. Moreover, as noted above, Keller expressly teaches that conventional films produced by biaxial orientation, such as Schloegl's films, are already tear-resistant in both directions. Therefore, Keller expressly teaches away from including a polymeric modifier in the core layer of Schloegl as asserted in the rejection. For all of these reasons, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Schloegl and Keller as concluded in the final rejection.

The differences in stress generated within a film produced by a conventional biaxial orientation process and a film produced by an unconventional secondary machine direction orientation process after biaxial orientation as disclosed in the Keller patent are explained in the Migliorini Declaration at ¶¶ 8-12. The Declaration explains that films are routinely biaxially

oriented without the need for modification to reduce stresses to prevent tearing during the production process. In contrast, the secondary machine direction orientation process as used in Keller generates high stresses within the film and results in a higher likelihood of film tearing and breaking. Therefore, modification of the core layer of films produced by a secondary machine orientation process to decreasing film tearing and breaking is desirable.

The Final Rejection argues that because all film production processes generate stress within a film, modification of the film to reduce stress is desirable. It is respectfully submitted that modification is only desirable and motivated when the modification leads to a beneficial result in the film or in the process of making the film. Otherwise it could be argued that it would be obvious to modify every film with any disclosed additive or process change, regardless of the benefit or desirability of doing so. It is well established law that the prior art must suggest the desirability of making the modification proposed in an obviousness rejection. The mere fact that the prior art could be modified is insufficient. The prior art must suggest the desirability of making the proposed modification. In re Laskowski, 871 F.2d 115, 117, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1399 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The suggestion to make the modification proposed in the Final Rejection is missing in the cited references.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse these rejections of claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 29-30.

Issue D

Claim 12 is rejected over the same application of the Schloegl and Keller patents, as applied in Issue C, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita. For the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 29-30 in Issue C, application of the Schloegl and Keller patents in combination with the Arita patent fails to render claim 12 obvious.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse this rejection of claim 12.

Issue E

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-28, 30, 33, 35, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,108,844 to Blemberg.

Peiffer discloses a multi-layer shrink film have a polyolefin core layer and alpha-olefin polymer outer layers. Peiffer discloses that low molecular weight petroleum resins may be added to the core layer. The Final Rejection acknowledges that Peiffer does not disclose or teach that a polymeric modifier should be added to the core layer. However, the rejection concludes that it would be obvious to add a polymer material of the type found in outer layers to the core layer for the purpose of promoting adhesion between the core layer and the outer layers. To support the conclusion of obviousness, the Final Rejection relies upon the Blemberg patent to suggest that a small concentration of polymeric material of the type used in one film layer may be included in an adjacent film layer to promote adhesion between the layers. Therefore, Blemberg is used to provide the same teaching asserted in the Final Rejection under Issue A discussed above wherein the Blemberg patent is combined with the Schloegl patent. As in the Schloegl patent, the Peiffer films incorporate adjacent polyolefin layers rather than adjacent polyolefin and polyester (and other non-polyolefins) layers as in Blemberg. As discussed with respect to Issue A, and supported by the Migliorini Declaration, adhesion problems between polyolefin film layers are not experienced in the film art. Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed with respect to Issue A, there is no motivation to modify the films of Peiffer to promote inter-layer adhesion. The obviousness rejection fails for lack of motivation to combine the references.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse these rejections of claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-18, and 29-30.

Issue F

Claim 12 is rejected over the same application of the Peiffer and Blemberg patents as in Issue E and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita. For the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13-28, 30, 33, 35, and 37-38 in Issue E, application of the

Peiffer and Blemberg patents in combination with the Arita patent fails to render claim 12 obvious.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse this rejection of claim 12.

Issue G

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-30, 33, 35, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,372,882 to Peiffer in view of U.S. Patent 5,691,043 to Keller. Peiffer discloses a multi-layer shrink film having a polyolefin core layer and alpha-olefin polymer outer layers. Peiffer discloses that low molecular weight petroleum resins may be added to the core layer. The Final Rejection acknowledges that Peiffer does not disclose or teach that a polymeric modifier should be added to the core layer. However, the rejection concludes that it would be obvious to add a polymeric modifier to the core layer of Peiffer's films, as taught by Keller, to relieve stresses in the films. Accordingly, Keller is used to provide the same teaching asserted in the Final Rejection with respect to Issue C, discussed above, wherein the Schloegl patent is combined with the Keller patent. As in the Schloegl patent, the Peiffer films are produced through conventional biaxial orientation processes. As discussed with respect to Issue C, tearing of conventional biaxially oriented films resulting from process stress is not experienced as in secondary machine direction orientation processes as disclosed by Keller. Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed with respect to Issue C, there is no motivation to modify the core layers of the films of Peiffer to promote reduce stress and prevent tearing. The obviousness rejection fails for lack of motivation to combine the references.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse these rejections of claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-30, 33, 35, and 37-38.

Issue H

Claim 12 is rejected over the same application of the Peiffer and Keller patents as applied in Issue G and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,490 to Arita. For the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-30, 33, 35, and 37-38 in Issue G, application

of the Peiffer and Keller patents in combination with the Arita patent fails to render claim 12 obvious.

It is respectfully requested that the Board reverse this rejection of claim 12.

9. Appendix

The attached Appendix contains a copy of claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 involved in this Appeal.

CONCLUSION

Appellants respectfully submit that the foregoing arguments obviate all of the final outstanding rejections in this Application. Reversal of all rejections by this Honorable Board is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2004

Rick F. James
Registration No. 48,772

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent)
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Telephone No. (281) 834-2438
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495

APPENDIX

CLAIMS:

1. A multi-layer polymeric shrink film comprising:

(a) a first skin layer having a first side and a second side, wherein the first skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, propylene-butene copolymers, and low density polyethylene;

(b) a core layer comprising polypropylene, a polymeric modifier, and a hydrocarbon resin wherein the core layer has a first side and a second side and the first side of the core layer is adjacent to the second side of the first skin layer; and

(c) a second skin layer having a first side and a second side wherein the first side of the second skin layer is adjacent to the second side of the core layer,

wherein the core layer comprises up to about 15 percent weight of the polymeric modifier and up to about 15 percent by weight of the hydrocarbon resin, wherein said film is biaxially oriented so as to be shrinkable in both the machine direction (MD) and the transverse direction (TD), and wherein said film has greater than 20% overall area reduction shrinkage at 135° C.

2. The film of claim 1 wherein the thickness is from about 8 microns to about 40 microns.

3. The film of claim 1 wherein the modifier in the core layer is selected from the group consisting of atactic polypropylene, syndiotactic polypropylene, ethylene-propylene copolymer, propylene-butylene copolymer, ethylene-propylene-butylene terpolymer, polybutylene, and linear low density polyethylene.

4. The film of claim 1 wherein the polypropylene in the core layer is isotactic polypropylene.

5. The film of claim 1 wherein the polypropylene in the core layer is recycled polypropylene.

6. The film of claim 1 wherein the hydrocarbon resin in the core layer is selected from the group consisting of petroleum resins, terpine resins, styrene resins, cyclopentediene resins, and saturated alicyclic resins.

7. The film according to claim 6 wherein the hydrocarbon resin is a saturated alicyclic resin.

9. The film of claim 1 wherein the core layer comprises from about 2 percent by weight to about 10 percent by weight of polymeric modifier and from about 2 percent by weight to about 10 percent by weight of hydrocarbon resin.

10. The film of claim 1 wherein the core layer comprises from about 80 percent by weight to about 95 percent by weight of the polypropylene.

12. The film of claim 1 wherein the first skin layer comprises low density polyethylene.

13. The film of claim 1 wherein the second skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, propylene-butene copolymers, and polyethylene.

14. The film of claim 1 wherein the first skin layer further comprises an anti-block agent.

15. The film of claim 1 wherein the second skin layer further comprises an anti-block agent.

16. The film of claim 1 wherein the film is oriented at least about five times in the machine direction (MD).

17. The film of claim 1 wherein the film is oriented about six to about ten times in the transverse direction (TD).

18. The film of claim 1 wherein the core layer represents about 70 to about 95 percent of the thickness of the total film.

19. A method for manufacturing a multi-layer polymeric shrink film comprising the steps of

(a) coextruding a first skin layer comprising a polymer, a core layer comprising polypropylene, a polymeric modifier, and a hydrocarbon resin, and a second skin layer comprising a polymer;

(b) stretching the film of step (a) in the machine direction (MD) at a temperature of 105° C or less; and

(c) stretching the film of step (b) in the transverse direction (TD),

wherein the core layer comprises up to about 15 percent weight of the polymeric modifier and up to about 15 percent by weight of the hydrocarbon resin, wherein said film is biaxially oriented so as to be shrinkable in both the machine direction (MD) and the transverse direction (TD), and wherein the first skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, propylene-butene copolymers, and low density polyethylene.

20. The method of claim 19 wherein the film is stretched from about 6 to about 10 times in the transverse direction (TD).

21. The method according to claim 19 where the film is stretched at least about 5 times in the machine direction (MD).

22. The method of claim 19 further comprising the step of coating the first skin layer.

23. The method of claim 19 further comprising the step of flame treating the first skin layer.

24. The method of claim 19 further comprising the step of corona treating the first skin layer.

25. The method of claim 19 further comprising the step of winding the film onto a reel.

26. The method of claim 19, wherein said film has greater than 20% overall area reduction shrinkage at 135° C.

27. The method of claim 21, wherein step (b) comprises stretching the film in the machine direction (MD) at a temperature of 90° C or less, and wherein step (c) comprises stretching the film from about 6 to about 10 times in the transverse direction (TD) at a temperature below 145° C.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein step (b) comprises stretching the film in the machine direction (MD) at a temperature of 75° C or less.

29. The film of claim 1 wherein the modifier in the core layer is selected from the group consisting of atactic polypropylene, syndiotactic poloypropylene and linear low density polyethylene,

wherein the first skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, and propylene-butene copolymers, and

wherein the second skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, and propylene-butene copolymers.

30. The film of claim 1 further comprising more than one core layer, wherein each core layer has the same composition.

33. The method of claim 19, wherein the second skin layer comprises a polymer selected from the group consisting of ethylene-propylene random copolymers, ethylene-propylene-butene random terpolymers, propylene-butene copolymers, and polyethylene.

35. The method of claim 21, wherein step (b) comprises stretching the film in the machine direction (MD) at a temperature of 90° C or less, and wherein step (c) comprises stretching the film from about 6 to about 10 times in the transverse direction (TD) at a temperature of 141° C. or below.

37. The method of claim 21, wherein the sum of the linear shrinkage in the machine direction (MD) and the linear shrinkage the transverse direction (TD) is at least 17.7% at 135° C.

38. The method of claim 35, wherein the sum of the linear shrinkage in the machine direction (MD) and the linear shrinkage the transverse direction (TD) is at least 31% at 135° C.